

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS  
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/14/11 12:00 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Texas Tech University (U411C110102)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                    | 20              | 16            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 20              | 16            |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 20              | 16            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - 84.411C Tier 2 Panel - 8: 84.411C

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Texas Tech University (U411C110102)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:
  - (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
  - (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.
  - (3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: We encourage eligible applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation

- (1) What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook and
- (2) IES/ NCEE Technical Methods papers.

### Strengths:

This is a well-articulated evaluation plan, offered by a qualified independent evaluation team. The evaluation is grounded in an explicit logic model which balances ambitious goals with a pragmatic and focused evaluation model and plan for assessing impact. The design assesses both short- and long-term outcomes. Each research question is to be measured with different specific analysis. The plan spells out and builds toward a competency-based outcome evaluation that incorporates both formative data tracking and monitoring with controlled statistical analyses of the overall impact. Instrumentation is described, as are plans for sample selection, data collection, and analyses.

### Weaknesses:

Although there are many strong elements in this design, there are missing components as well. The evaluation design would be strengthened by details on sample selection processes, especially how you are incorporating diversity in the samples and controlling for moderating factors and attrition. It would also be helpful to have information about the validation of project-specific instruments that will be used (e.g., qualifying examinations, Haberman dispositions). Finally, the absence of an evaluation budget leaves us without substance on the level of effort this will involve.

Reader's Score: 16

---

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/14/11 12:00 AM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/12/11 12:00 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Texas Tech University (U411C110102)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                    | 20              | 17            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 20              | 17            |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 20              | 17            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - 84.411C Tier 2 Panel - 8: 84.411C

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Texas Tech University (U411C110102)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

**Note:** We encourage eligible applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation

(1) What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook and

(2) IES/ NCEE Technical Methods papers.

### Strengths:

The arrangement of joint evaluation team from various fields is the strength of the project evaluation. The evaluation team consists of personnel from schools, a university, and an industry, which will bring forth multiple perspectives. Importantly, program designs and evaluation plans are laid out with specific timelines and qualified evaluators.

The evaluation plans are well presented aligning with program objectives and intervention activities. In particular, this project team considers not only short term outcomes but also long term outcomes for each objective and intervention, collecting data several times (4 to 6 times per year).

The team attempts to come up with a budget plan by calculating the cost for each student.

### Weaknesses:

The longitudinal data collection for the evaluation plan can be costly and take up a large amount of resources.

On page 21, the team claimed the use of experimental design for this project, but they failed to describe the procedure to reach an experimental design or even a quasi-experimental design (on page 22).

Reader's Score: 17

---

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/12/11 12:00 AM

